Expiry Date - 17-11-2015

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – APPROVE**
AWDM/1389/15

Site: **6B Eighth Avenue Lancing**

Proposal: **Single-storey rear extension incorporating existing garage**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: /N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The proposal is for a single storey rear extension (full details of which are provided in the submitted drawings). The extension would adjoin the existing detached garage.

The application site is a semi-detached two-storey building. Its walls are a mix of brick and tile, with section of tile hanging. The roof is made of concrete tile.

The application property is situated across a green where there is a mixture of property types.

Relevant Planning History
L/65/02/TP
Ground and first floor rear extension
Approved Conditionally 20-05-02

AWDM/1244/12
First floor side extension
Refused 27.11.2012

Consultations
Lancing Parish Council: *Objection. Too many previous extensions to the property and latest proposal a step too far and out of scale with the rest of the property and seen as an over development of a single property.*

Southern Water: *please attach informative*

Representations
None

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance
National Planning Policy Framework

Adur Local Plan: AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 ‘Supplementary Planning Guidance’ comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle

Visual amenity

The objection from the Parish Council is recognised, and the issues that have been raised are understood. It is true the host building has been subject to an extension and conservatory built in the past, but both are at the rear and not visible from public vantage.

The same situation will apply to this latest proposed extension; the appearance of the host building from the street would not differ from now if the proposed extension was built. In contrast, the previous first floor extension was refused because it would be harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene.

Part of the proposed extension footprint would incorporate the existing conservatory. A private garden length of some 17.5 metres and 8 metres width would be retained – this would continue to provide for private outdoor space suitable for a family, and a garden of comparable size to other properties facing onto The Green. The proposal is therefore not overdevelopment.

The proposed extension is single storey and flat roof. Its roof height sits at the same level as the roof of the existing garage and the existing rear extension. The roof light would sit marginally above this. It does have a large footprint. However this still less than the original host dwelling. Given this circumstance, the scale of the extension would be subservient with the original architectural integrity of the host dwelling remaining intact.

Residential amenity – effect on existing dwellings

It is the neighbours immediately to the north and south who would be principally affected by this development (which is removed from the remainder).

Neighbour to south

The extension would be concealed behind the existing garage to the southern boundary, so would not give rise to adverse harm.

Neighbour to north

This neighbouring building has itself been extended by way of a rear extension and a rear conservatory. However the side glazing of the neighbour’s conservatory is already compromised by the existing extension. Beyond this, the

neighbour's conservatory is tapered away from the shared boundary. The length of proposed conservatory beyond the neighbour's would measure 1.9 metres – the impact arising from which would more than satisfy the Council's adopted standard in terms of overbearing and overshadowing. There is an existing mature hedge on the boundary which already limits light and outlook to some extent.

The absence of windows/openings in the side elevations of the extension ensures intrusive loss of privacy would be avoided, with overlooking limited to being oblique in its nature.

Recommendation

Approve, subject to the following conditions:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved Plans
3. Exterior materials/finishes to match

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? Y

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Case Officer signed: Matthew Porter Date: 02-11-2015

Authorised and signed by: Peter Barnett Date: 3 November 2015